
3B

Action

Professional Services Committee

Adoption of the Passing Score Standard for the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE)

AGENDA INSERT

Executive Summary: This report provides the Commission with recommendations relevant to the determination of passing score standards for the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video.

Recommended Action: That the Commission adopt the recommended passing score standards for the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video.

Presenters: Michael Taylor and Yvonne Novelli, Consultants, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

August 2011

Adoption of the Passing Score Standard for the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE)

Introduction

This agenda item insert presents standard setting results for the California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE) Written and CPACE-Video components of the CPACE examination, and provides staff-recommended initial passing standards for each component based on the recommendations from the CPACE Standard Setting Panel. Appendix A contains the aggregate demographic information of the panel members.

Background

The purpose of these standard setting studies is to provide the Commission with recommendations based on the informed judgments of California educators and relevant to the determination of the initial passing standards for the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video components of the CPACE examination. Individuals must pass both components in order to pass the CPACE.

As with the standard setting method used for all other Commission examinations, the process employed for both CPACE components was consistent with recognized psychometric principles and procedures, as outlined in Appendix B. The standard setting studies for the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video were conducted on July 12-13, 2011.

CPACE Standard Setting Panel Results

During the CPACE standard setting studies, panel members were asked to consider a hypothetical candidate who is *just* at the level of knowledge and skills important for effective job performance as a beginning administrator in California public schools. The performance of this minimally competent candidate reflects the panel-recommended minimum passing standards.

CPACE-Written Panel Results

The Standards Setting Panel followed the procedure outlined in the main agenda item to determine a passing standard recommendation for the CPACE-Written. Following the study, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (Evaluation Systems) calculated the median panel-recommended score for the multiple-choice and constructed-response components. Table 1 provides a summary of the CPACE-Written component, including the number of scorable items by item type, the total possible points by item type, and the median panel-recommended passing standard.

Table 1: Panel-Recommended Passing Standard for the CPACE-Written

CPACE Component	Item Type	Total Scorable Items	Total Possible Score Points ¹	Median Panel-Recommended Passing Standard	Component Score Combination Rule ²
Written	Multiple-Choice	60	60	48	60%
	Constructed-Response	4	64	50	40%

- 1 Each constructed response is scored independently by two scorers, and the scores are totaled for the final raw score. The score range is from “1” (limited or no understanding) to “4” (thorough understanding). The total possible raw score points for each item is 8, which is then multiplied by a weighting factor, resulting in a maximum of 64 possible points on the CR section.
2. The component score combination rule indicates the proportion assigned to the multiple-choice section and to constructed-response section in determining an overall score on the examination.

CPACE-Video Panel Results

Following the CPACE-Video standard setting study, Evaluation Systems also calculated the median score based on each individual member’s recommendation for the Video component. Table 2 provides a summary of the assessment, including the total possible raw score an examinee may achieve and the median panel-recommended passing standard.

Table 2: Panel-Recommended Passing Standard for the CPACE-Video

CPACE Component	Item Type	Total Scorable Items	Total Possible Score Points ¹	Median Panel-Recommended Passing Standard
Video	Video Packet	1	8	6

- 1 The video submission is scored independently by two scorers, and the two scores are totaled for the final raw score. The score ranges from “1” (little or no understanding) to “4” (thorough understanding).

Staff-Recommended Initial Passing Standards

In accordance with established Commission procedure for its testing programs, staff considered adjusting the panel-recommended passing standard to address the standard error of measurement (SEM), as noted in Appendix B. Because passage of this examination is in lieu of an entire education administration program, including the practicum, and could place the passing examinee in a pivotal position in an educational setting, staff’s recommendation for the CPACE-Written does not incorporate this adjustment. Additionally, the staff’s CPACE-Video recommended passing standard does not reflect this error adjustment because examinees are encouraged to review their work and submit their best effort, which should reflect their true knowledge. As with other Commission examinations, individuals who do not meet the passing standards have multiple opportunities to retake the examination.

For the CPACE-Written, staff recommends that the Commission adopt the median of the CPACE Standard Setting Panel’s recommended passing standard of 48 points on the multiple-

choice section and 50 points on the constructed-response section. If the Commission adopts the staff recommendation, the passing rate for the 116 examinees who took the June CPACE-Written administration will be 30%.

For the CPACE-Video, staff recommends that the Commission adopt the median CPACE Standard Setting Panel's recommended passing standard of 6 points. If the Commission adopts the staff recommendation, the passing rate for the 62 examinees who met the June CPACE-Video submission deadline will be 71%.

If the Commission adopts staff's recommendations, for those individuals who completed both needed components of the CPACE in June 2011, the overall passing rate would be 26%.

Following Adoption

After the Commission adopts the passing standards for the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video, notification will be posted on the CPACE website and distributed to the field as soon as possible. In addition, the June examinees' scores will be tabulated based on the adopted passing standards and, as discussed in the main agenda item, scaled to a range of 100 to 300, with 220 representing the adopted passing standard for each CPACE component. The individual examinee's score reports will then be distributed within three to four weeks of the Commission's decision. For both the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video, the passing standards adopted by the Commission and applied to the June 2011 test results will also be applied to all subsequent administrations.

APPENDIX A

Demographic Characteristics of the CPACE Standard Setting Panel

Total Number	
Participated	8
Ethnicity	
African American or Black	1
Asian American	
Filipino	
Southeast Asian American	
Pacific Island American	
Mexican American / Chicano	1
Latin American / Other Hispanic	
Native American	
White (non-Hispanic)	6
Other	
Gender	
Female	6
Male	2
Region	
North	2
South	6
Current Profession	
Public School Administrator	3
College/University Administrative Personnel Educator	4
Other	1
Years of K-12 Experience Related to Administration*	
0-3	
4-6	
7-10	1
11+	7
Years of Experience as an Administrative Personnel Educator*	
0-3	
4-6	2
7-10	
11+	3

* Some members have had multiple professions.

Appendix B

Standard Setting Considerations

As described in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education, 1999), the standard setting process is a key piece of validity evidence supporting a testing program.

Defining the minimum level of knowledge and skill required for licensure or certification is one of the most important and difficult tasks facing those responsible for credentialing. Verifying the appropriateness of the cut score or scores on the tests is a critical element in validity. The validity of the inference drawn from the test depends on whether the standard for passing makes a valid distinction between adequate and inadequate performance. Often, panels of experts are used to specify the level of performance that should be required. Standards must be high enough to protect the public, as well as the practitioner, but not so high as to be unreasonably limiting. Verifying the appropriateness of the cut score or scores on a test used for licensure or certification is a critical element of the validity of test results (p. 157).

In making recommendations to the Commission regarding passing standards, staff considered the following factors and options that affect the standard setting process in determining a staff recommendation.

Professional Judgments

The recommended passing standards for the CPACE-Written and CPACE-Video components are based upon the professional judgments provided by the members of the CPACE Standard Setting Panel. Since the panel recommendations are criterion-referenced—based on expert judgment of the minimum required knowledge and skills for beginning administrators—examinee performance data provides supplemental, though not necessary, information.

Standard Error of Measurement

Each time an examinee takes a test, there is a random chance that the score will be slightly different, and applying the standard error of measurement (SEM) is one way to take this into account. The standard error allows educational analysts to determine a range of scores an examinee would receive if tested repeatedly without studying or contemplating the answers between tests. By applying this technical adjustment, a given examinee's score may be more representative of "true" knowledge because the variation in scores is taken into account, and it provides a safeguard against placing undue emphasis on a single test score.